UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-6914

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

KWAME DEMETT BINTA, a/k/a Karl D. Bolling,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Richard L. Williams, Senior District Judge. (CR-00-144-R; CA-02-595)

Submitted: August 20, 2004 Decided: September 7, 2004

Before WIDENER, LUTTIG, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kwame Demett Binta, Appellant Pro Se. Paul Joseph McNulty, United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, Stephen Wiley Miller, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Kwame Demett Binta seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his motion filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2255 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Binta has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Binta's motion for a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED